DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 360 EA 011 761

AUTHOR	Scofield, Sandra
TITLE	Principals Make a Difference: The Role They Play in Quality Reading Programs. OSSC Bulletin, Vol. 22, No. 10.
INSTITUTION	Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
PUB DATE	Jun 79
NOTE	26p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oregon School Study Council, 124 College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($2.00, $1.50 prepaid; quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Principals; *Program Administration; Program Planning; Reading Material Selection; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; Remedial Reading Programs; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

Practical ways principals can modify and monitor their school's reading programs are suggested in this report that also presents reading theory and research results. The bulk of the report focuses on the elementary school and is divided into a short section on theory and a longer section on practice. Suggestions are given about establishing reading as a priority, selecting and managing a program, placement and grouping, selecting a management system, and supervision and support of teachers. The portion of the report that focuses on middle, junior high, and secondary schools emphasizes remedial techniques for older students with reading problems. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

OSSC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

PREFACE

Interest has been revived recently in the teaching of basic skills. Of foremost concern to the public is reading instruction. Research also indicates that a successful academic program is dependent on the leadership of the building principal.

In this BULLETIN, "Principals Make a Difference: The Role They Play in Quality Reading Programs," Sandra Scofield discusses the key role of the principal as instructional leader for a school reading program.

Dr. Scofield is a reading teacher and a consultant for the Central Point School District (Jim Tacchini, Superintendent). She also teaches field courses for the University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College.

This BULLETIN will be of interest not only to principals, but to all members of the educational community interested in quality reading instruction.

Kenneth A. Erickson
Executive Secretary
Oregon School Study Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item	Page
INTRODUCTION: PRINCIPALS AND PROGRAMS	1
THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2
Naming the Variables	2
Programs that work	2
Teachers that teach	3
Controlling the Variables	5
Establishing reading as a priority	5
Selecting a program	6
Managing the program	7
Placement and grouping	8
Flexible grouping	10
Management system	11
Supervision and support for teachers	12
Observing for specific behaviors	12
Conferences	13
Providing Inservice	14
MIDDLE, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS	15
Reading is Still a Basic Skill	15
Finding the Lost Reader	17
A Place for Reading	17
SUMMARY: A WORD TO THE PRINCIPAL	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

INTRODUCTION: PRINCIPALS AND PROGRAMS

Probably no single educational quest has been of greater general concern to schools and parents, nor cost more in research and evaluation dollars, than the search for "the right way to teach reading." Yet large scale efforts such as the cooperative reading studies of the sixties were disappointing. No clear prescriptions emerged. While the public, and to a great extent the professional community, debated look-say vs. phonics (as if reading were so simple an issue), studies identified numerous factors that affect reading instruction. The studies did not specify which factors mattered most and certainly did not identify the "right way."

In the last decade fresh perspectives and improved research have begun sketches that may yet become pictures of what ought to be. This research is discussed in the first section of this BULLETIN. Of particular interest is the growing emphasis on the role of the principal as instructional leader responsible for the building reading program. Administrative leadership matters in reading.

Although the principal relies on teachers to teach a program and draws on consultants for special needs, it is the principal who must make programs work. Pulling people, ideas, processes and kids together must be accomplished if reading instruction is to be successful program-wide.

In this BULLETIN I have summarized key information from recent research. I have not attempted to dictate reading methodology. I have tried to suggest practical ways administrators can modify and monitor

their programs and to provide guidelines for thinking about reading. I hope this BULLETIN will serve as an impetus for further study and dialogue.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Naming the Variables

Programs that work. Across a number of studies in this decade that looked at successful schools and compared them to the less successful, a composite picture has emerged that is worth considering. The elements that seem to make a difference are listed below.

1. Heading successful programs are STRONG PRINCIPALS: leaders with clear points of view about schooling and instruction; leaders with strong commitments to reading and high expectations of staffs.

2. HIGH EXPECTATIONS of children mark success. Even in inner-city schools teachers who avoided pessimistic views of children and who conveyed optimism and firm expectations of achievement got achievement.

3. In schools where children achieved STAFF MORALE was generally high. Teachers and principals saw themselves as involved in a common mission and functioned as a team.

4. Successful schools were ORDERLY without being repressive.

Successful reading programs identified in Educational Programs That Work, a publication by the United States Office of Education, share certain characteristics similar to those above:

1. Structured reading curriculum with hierarchal sequencing.

2. Heavy focus on direct teaching of decoding skills.

3. Well-planned coordination among classroom teachers and support staff.

4. Flexible grouping.

5. Positive expectations.

6. Elements of systematic instruction.

7. Cumulative, consistent testing program.

8. Well-defined management system.

9. Interrelationship of reading with other language arts skills.

10. Emphasis on diagnostic teaching.

11. Inclusion of literature and leisure reading in program.

12. Sufficient time spent in reading instruction.

13. Inservice that reinforces the program.

It is apparent from these summaries that a successful program requires strong leadership to hold it together and give it focus.

Teachers that teach. Researchers have generally shifted focus from attempts to determine which method is best to attempts to identify a pattern of variables that affect achievement. It is becoming possible to describe at least some characteristics of effective teachers of basic skills--perhaps not without reservation, but well enough to suggest guidelines and provoke discussion. This is especially true in regard to the teaching of beginning reading.

The more effective teacher (1) spends more time instructing pupils; (2) uses behavior management techniques effectively; (3) uses overt, active responses and provides ample feedback on responses; (4) moves from prompted to unprompted learning, moving children to independent practice

only when they have achieved minimal mastery of a skill; (5) expects mastery, with rate as well as accuracy as a criterion; and (6) is very well organized.

Note that patterns like these vary somewhat by subject focus and grade level as well as by socioeconomic status of pupils. The message is quite powerful for primary teachers however. At the intermediate level where there is generally a pattern of increased variety in materials and independence in reading, there are indications that children do better when the teacher interacts closely with students and text guiding ample discussion of what is read. This is somewhat different than the pattern of brisk, tightly sequenced group response instruction that appeared effective for younger children.

The descriptions of effective reading teachers seem related to an old concept that has resurfaced--mastery learning. It is less a teaching technique than a way of viewing instruction, one that assumes that time is the crucial variable in learning. Mastery learning is related to the effective teacher studies described above in at least two aspects: (1) it assumes that we will teach all children to criterion rather than leaving some behind as we move ahead, and (2) it assumes that all children should master basic skills and therefore must be given sufficient instruction to do so. Mastery learning says how well a student must be able to do a particular skill and how the teacher will know. It also says that instruction and practice will vary for different children according to amounts of both they need.

It seems then that we may be expecting too little of children (what they can achieve at various levels) while at the same time expecting too much (achievement without sufficient practice). The above discussion implies that the lower-achieving reader, so often sent out of the classroom for special programs, might be accommodated by better instruction. To achieve that, however, may require considerable change of convictions and new training.

The administrator who sees a discrepancy between the descriptions of successful programs outlined above and the practices in a given school will want to move cautiously but certainly consider moving. The movement must be toward a program that works, and it must start with a very precise picture of what is going on now.

Controlling the Variables

Establishing reading as a priority. Right to Read has suggested three criteria for determining whether or not reading is a district priority: time, money, and quality. If there are insufficient commitments of the first two factors the third will probably suffer. Yet quantities of time and money do not assure quality either. If the principal is committed to establishing reading as a priority, s/he may want to reflect on the status of the three factors and then assume these three roles:

1. The principal is a DISTRICT ADVOCATE for commitments of time and money to reading. S/he presents clear, well-explained requests for support in order to provide inservice and materials for teachers.

2. The principal is an INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER in the building. Keeping abreast of reading knowledge is important business. Teachers too are

expected to keep informed--and the principal provides a flow of information. The principal facilitates staff discussions to consider reading issues. If specialists are available the principal acts to assure that the advice and activities of specialists are consonant with building goals and procedures.

3. The principal is a SUPERVISOR in the classroom. As primary supervisor in the building, the principal is aware of the activities of all support personnel such as consultants, remedial teachers, aides, and the like. It is the responsibility of the principal to assure continuity and consistency.

Selecting a program. The reading series now available are expensive, important investments. Fortunately, a lot is available for the money. The old "buy a basal, fault on phonics" problem is fading. Many series have strong phonics strands, criterion tests, and management systems. How do you select a series? Consider these factors.

1. What kinds of kids do we teach? If a sizable number of youngsters come to school with the characteristics that predict problems, then the structure, consistency, and pacing of a program are more important than the pictures or even the important concerns about representation of minority groups. If children come to school with strong backgrounds, choices are probably greater and factors other than the ways skills are presented can matter a lot.

2. What strengths/weaknesses exist in this staff? Although teachers may have come from many different colleges originally they have shared common experiences as a staff. They have probably also shared instructors

in their standard or masters program. Furthermore, the program that has been in use will have influenced teaching practices. What kind of program will fit this staff? Or is the staff willing to be retrained. Will the district provide sufficient training to learn new methods?

3. What does this district/staff believe about reading? At the time new reading series are being considered the principal will want to provoke some discussion of just what reading is. This is not an idle exercise. If teachers believe reading to be a "bottom-up" process, one that grows from decoding skill to fluent, accurate reading to processing greater units of print, a strong decoding base with controlled introduction of text will probably be suitable. If most teachers espouse instead, a "top-down" psycholinguistic view of reading in which children's experiences, oral language, and interests greatly affect comprehension, they may prefer a program built more on children's language and interests rather than regularities in the language. Neither view is right nor wrong. What is a problem is not knowing what you think and thus acting from a vague pedagogical base.

Managing the program. One of the major leadership functions in a good reading program is management. The effective program is not idiosyncratic to the teacher from room to room. It does not allow a resource teacher to "run his/her own shop" isolated in method and materials from the classroom. Although the effective program uses a range of materials and even may use more than one commercial program (a series is not a reading program), there is a frame or core that makes the program consistent and integrated.

Placement and grouping. Almost every school has some kind of standardized testing program. Effective programs also have a consistent program of diagnostic testing. The two are not the same. At one extreme teachers do not discuss tests and sometimes don't even know the results of the annual survey testing. Teachers need to understand what testing tells them about the program--how children are faring from year to year as a group, where the program seems to be weak, and where tested skills deviate from the goals of the program. On the other hand, standardized test scores are not good data for making decisions about individual children. Ample evidence exists to show that scores for a particular child may be off by several years from actual achievement. Survey tests are not diagnostic tests either. They do not sample enough behaviors nor give back information for decisions about instruction. They are intended to give feedback to programs not individuals.

Test-makers and reading specialists alike concur in admonitions to administrators not to convey information about standardized survey tests too quickly or without sufficient explanation. The usual practice is to discuss grade level equivalents, yet that is the most difficult way to explain test results and the most likely information to be misinterpreted by parents. Many experts advise instead that parents and teachers too look at stanines* and interpret placement of particular children in particular stanines as "average," "quite a bit below average," and the like. A principal who is not comfortable explaining stanines or percentiles can ask for help in interpreting them and afterwards avoid the trap of saying, "Your fourth grader reads like a second grader."

Survey tests can function as screeners to identify children with potential problems and again stanines can be very helpful. Reading specialists often go through test results to identify children in the lower three stanines and explore their needs by further testing or conferences with classroom teachers. Children who scored in the lower three stanines may have been feeling tired that day, or may have hated the test, or may have been frightened--but they may have problems in reading. They should be considered.

Within the instructional setting the best source of information to help teachers in placement is probably the informal reading inventory (IRI). Some experts have wondered whether teachers are well enough trained to use the IRI effectively, but most recommend its use. By having children read a range of materials that will be used in instruction the teacher has the best chance to provide optimum teaching.

The teacher needs to know a child's INDEPENDENT READING LEVEL where reading is fairly fluent with a low occurrence of errors. Then the teacher can assign or assist a child in selecting independent reading (an important part of a program). The teacher can monitor the difficulty of reading workbooks (often totally overlooked), and the teacher can avoid keeping children at their independent level in instruction where they would not be challenged. The child should be taught using materials at his INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL where the presence of the teacher is necessary, where new words and skills can be introduced at a comfortable rate, and where skill is accelerated by instruction.

A child should not be working with materials at his/her FRUSTRATION level where errors are so frequent or comprehension is so poor that the

child cannot get the meaning or proceed fluently even with instruction.

The principal may want to discuss the use of IRIs in the classroom and provide a session of training if the practice is infrequent or inconsistent. It might also be profitable to discuss some of these issues in regard to accommodating various reading levels:

> If children are reading above grade level, can they be placed at their instructional level in the series used? What happens at grades 5 and 6 where some children are reading at seventh or eighth grade level? Are materials available? How can you be sure above-level children will not be "put on hold" or forced to repeat levels?
>
> Just what do teachers mean by "comprehension"? Do they consider the child's ability to DO something with what s/he reads such as to write based upon reading? Children who are very fluent decoders are sometimes pressed into independent reading when in fact they are not so expert at processing what they read. "Going through the next two levels" does not just mean reading the stories. It implies mastering skills suggested by the materials or chosen by the teacher as appropriate.
>
> How are reading levels accommodated in subject areas? This begins to be a very important consideration in the intermediate grades. If the social studies textbook for fifth grade is written at fifth grade readability level, for example, what will you do for readers who are not functioning at that level?

Flexible grouping. Grouping should allow shifts among groups for purposes of new skills or reviews, leisure reading, and other activities. Some experts go so far as to suggest that teachers should eliminate the round-robin practices we associate with reading groups; that oral reading has a place only as performance (after much practice) or as diagnosis (on a one-to-one basis). Teachers will surely try to fit both kinds of oral reading into the classroom, but a more conservative practice within groups might be simply to say that children should not be asked to read new selections until they have mastered new words or demonstrated the

skills they will need in the passages. "Cold" readings in the presence of others should be limited to passages at independent level.

Furthermore, groups should not be formed as rigid entities that label children from start to finish. The teacher can look for opportunities to form groups from time to time on the basis of friendship and interest. Instructional groupings should be frequently reconsidered.

There is a larger grouping pattern than that of the individual classroom. Reading groups may occur across grades or other classes of the same grade. Although there is not evidence to convince experts that one pattern is more effective than another, it seems important that the grouping pattern be based on a decision rather than just happening. When teachers talk about grouping they are talking about children and important interactions can occur.

Whatever pattern of grouping is used it is crucial that lines of communication be established to assure best services to problem readers, effective transitions from grade to grade, and opportunities for teachers to share problems and practices.

Management system. Every program needs one. Systems may take many forms--checklists, anecdotal records, series systems, and the like. Consider:

1. Does the system allow for timely identification of problem readers (skill deficiencies) rather than letting them pile up at the end?

2. Does the system allow for efficient record keeping?

These questions indicate a bias for a common system across the staff even though individual teachers keep more detailed records of their own

choosing. The principal who has not tackled this concern should be aware that teachers who have not used a management system or who have worked out their own various ones will probably resist the idea. Here are some hypothetical scraps of dialogue.

TEACHERS: "It's just a lot of paperwork."

PRINCIPAL: "I'll make sure the system is well-explained with inservice time to practice using it and time to raise questions. It is important."

TEACHER: "This is a waste of time. Nobody uses all these folders."

PRINCIPAL: "Oh, but we will!"

Record keeping will be a waste of time if it only fills file drawers. As an impetus to dialogue and planning, however, it is an invaluable activity.

Supervision and Support for Teachers

Observing for specific behaviors. Drawing on knowledge of effective practices the principal, as supervisor, can focus classroom observations on desired behaviors. Detailed, positive discussion of specific skills can pay off in better teaching. Some possible focuses are listed with comments below.

1. Is the teacher using the program? The principal specifies and looks for particular aspects such as diagnostic procedures, use of the management component, or use of the student reading books. A teacher may have good reason to modify program aspects. The principal needs to know the reason.

2. Is the objective of each segment of the lesson clear? The teacher should be able to articulate the objective and explain or demonstrate that materials have been organized to correlate with the objective. S/he should also convey clearly to the students the objectives of the task they are about.

3. Are transitions from objective to objective and from group to group smooth and orderly?

4. Is the teacher enthusiastic? Responsive? Does he or she move at a good pace? Does he or she provide feedback that is focused on a specific skill or process?

5. Does seatwork reinforce skills PREVIOUSLY TAUGHT? Have skills been sufficiently practiced under direct supervision? Are there arrangements for checking seatwork and for getting feedback? Are there options for children who finish early?

6. Are supplementary materials available? Does anyone CHOOSE to read? Is there a chance in the day to talk about reading? Does the teacher ever read to the children?

Conferences. Another function the principal may fulfill is that of consultant discussing with a teacher a particular child or a particular skill focus. Even if the principal does not feel like an expert in reading, the willingness to share the teacher's concern and to listen sympathetically can be an important contribution to instruction. If a pattern emerges across teachers or children the principal can better identify in-service needs.

Providing inservice. In planning inservice here are some things to keep in mind:

1. Some of what has been learned in reading research wasn't known when a lot of teachers were trained. That is not the teachers' fault!

2. If possible, let teachers have a say in the focus and the format of inservice. But don't hesitate to present new methods if you are convinced teachers should consider them. They are professionals who want to continue to grow.

3. For 20 minutes of consultant time provide for at least 30 minutes of staff time for follow-up. If possible, also provide for demonstrations in classrooms. Be very aware that materials for new instructional approaches can be different and preparation more extensive and time-consuming than for old ways, at least for a while.

4. Consider alternatives to traditional inservice such as teacher exchanges.

5. Try to use certification and credit needs for focused inservice. Get required courses taught in your own district through the Division of Continuing Education and request that the instructor relate instruction to identified needs. You may have to pay for an extra day of planning time or a chance for the instructor to meet with a committee, but it would be money well spent. Also, ask teachers who take courses to bring back ideas to the staff.

6. Reinforce teachers for trying new behaviors. Remember teachers can feel vulnerable and threatened if they do not see support for risk-taking. As far as that goes, reinforce teachers for what they already do well!

7. Be absolutely clear and firm if you expect teachers to try specific new skills in their classrooms. Be prepared to focus supervision on the desired skills and to provide additional follow-up. Consider asking a consultant to spend an extra hour with you after a presentation reviewing ways you can help teachers and what you should look for in teaching.

MIDDLE, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Reading is Still a Basic Skill

Some of the statements that follow may seem almost simplistic. Yet obvious as they are, practices above sixth grade do not generally indicate that reading issues are really considered in planning curriculum, choosing materials, or developing strategies.

1. Many children leave elementary school with reading skills below sixth grade level. If those skills are not sufficiently low to merit the special services of resource rooms or Title I programs, those students may very well carry their fourth or fifth grade reading ability with them right through high school. The "gray area" student who is low-average in elementary school needs help with reading for some time after. If that help does not come in developmental reading programs, it must come from teachers of science, history, accounting, health, and the like.

2. Continued skill development does imply instruction in reading (though the reading may be focused on any subject). "Reading along" is not at all the same thing as giving students strategies for analyzing and organizing the information they read.

3. Assigning reading is not teaching reading. On the other hand, if reading is not ever assigned fluency and comprehension skills are not enhanced. How do parents in your community feel about homework? If a lot of your high school students have part-time jobs does that eliminate solid reading assignments? Should it?

4. A student's reading of subject matter is much more useful and efficient if s/he knows why the reading is being assigned. If you see teachers giving handouts and saying, "Read this, we'll have a quiz/discussion tomorrow," look a little closer and see how students handle such tasks.

5. The major factor we have been able to identify in comprehension is vocabulary--yet vocabulary is seldom taught in a systematic way. When students in subject-focused classes are assigned tasks related to vocabulary rather than taught directly, they must: (a) be able to read the words, and (b) know how to find the definitions. Find out how concepts are presented in classes in your building.

6. Every time a textbook is selected a decision has been made--intentionally or not--about who will read it and who will not. The range of reading ability in a secondary class can easily be from five to nine years. No one book can reach that range optimally. Can supplementary materials be made available? Has the teacher planned for ways to help the low reader gain the knowledge other than in independent reading? Are better readers challenged to use what they read other than in literal, fact-focused tasks?

Finding the Lost Reader

Some of the problems alluded to above are exacerbated by the very structure of the curriculum once children leave self-contained classrooms. When a teacher has four or five or six groups a day, and those groups change several times during the year, there is a physical limit to how much the teacher can know about students quickly. Again, standardized tests can provide a screening to identify students who are likely to have trouble reading. Students who score in lower stanines should receive further attention to determine just what their needs are and how they will be met. Classroom teachers must be reminded of the presence of poor readers in the building. They should be trained to assess textbook reading skill informally. These efforts may prevent misunderstanding of "behavior problems" from students who don't know what's going on in class.

A Place for Reading

Here, then are questions the principal may want to think about and to present to teachers as appropriate.

> How are students identified as remedial readers? Are only very poor readers served or is there help for low-average students who have not developed effective strategies for dealing with the special demands of the textbook?
>
> Where do I assume students are acquiring study skills such as using the library, organizing notes, reading graphs and charts, and the like. Who provides supplemental instruction if students do not have such skills?
>
> Do teachers of particular subjects assume that the above skills are already mastered by students? What if they aren't? Who in my building knows how to use a readability formula? Is there someone on every textbook selection committee?
>
> Are there alternatives to the reading-lab-for-reading/content-classroom-for-instruction dichotomy? Is it possible to form science or social studies labs where students work on content and reading using materials they can handle while learning to

cope with textbooks, not programmed readers or reading kits? Can I get my reading teacher(s) out of the reading labs and into other classrooms? At least, can my reading teachers present very specific skills sessions for my staff such as teaching of vocabulary, or attacking new words by analyzing the structure, or setting a purpose for reading?

SUMMARY: A WORD TO THE PRINCIPAL

So where should you start if you want to improve your leadership in reading?

First look for your own strengths. There must have been times in reading this BULLETIN when you recognized your own practices. Put them in perspective. How can you build from them?

Next look at your own program in a systematic fashion. Check those factors that you feel are important to you (use this BULLETIN as a worksheet!), and go through them one by one. Assess what you know about how your program is working and how you are functioning in it.

Find out how teachers feel about the program. How much of what they do can they explain in such a way that you see consistency and clarity across classrooms? Where do they have felt needs? Responding to teacher needs is an excellent strategy if you put those needs in the context of a larger program review (even if just in your own head). You don't want to focus on something small if there are more urgent problems unless the return in morale warrants diverting resources from major efforts.

Put reading on the agenda of your principals' meetings. You can learn from one another. You can present consolidated needs to the central office. You may even identify inservice needs of your own.

Put faith in your own leadership.

Keep up.

Keep at it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I have not attempted a scholarly, exhaustive bibliography. Additional references can be identified by using the services of information-searchers at university libraries or through the education service districts. What follows is a practical reference list--one that the reader can turn to when seeking more information on a particular topic touched on in this BULLETIN. I have tried to select references that are themselves readable and practical.

The Role of the Principal/Instructional Leader

Barnard, Douglas, and Hetzel, Robert W. The Principal's role in reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, January 1976, 386-388. Discusses three critical managerial competencies required for the principal in improving reading instruction, and presents a useful "Principal's Self-Evaluation Checklist."

Carlson, Thorsten R., ed. Administrators and Reading, 1979. A collection of articles written by school administrators and college educators for the administrator who is not a reading expert. Available from Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 757 Third Avenue, New York, New York. $8.50.

Jackson, Shirley A. The Quest for reading programs that work. Educational Leadership, December 1978, 168-70. Discusses characteristics of programs identified by USOE as exemplary.

Sanacore, Joseph. Reading leadership: An annotated bibliography. Journal of Reading, May 1979, 739-744. An excellent list of references for administrators, supervisors, consultants. Reflects current ideas. References are easily available.

Smith, Richard; Otto, Wayne, and Hansen, Lee. The School Reading Program. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1978. Subtitled "A Handbook for Teachers, Supervisors, and Specialists," this book would be especially useful for the administrator who does not have a reading consultant available. Good guidelines in curriculum, management, inservice and evaluation.

Elementary Reading

Cunningham, Patricia; Arthur, Sharon, and Cunningham, James. Classroom Reading Instruction K-5: Alternative Approaches. A narrative, fictionalized account of several approaches to teaching reading, including language experience and individualized programs as well as more conventional ones. Good for seeing what a particular method "looks like in real life."

Lapp, Diane, and Flood, James. Teaching Reading to Every Child. New York: Macmillan, 1978. This big book is a comprehensive reading methods text, with excellent overviews of research, clear guidelines for teaching, and many helpful activities. Helpful because it is quite specific. Discussions of research are also thought-provoking.

Indrisano, Roselmina. Organizational patterns for reading instruction. Unpublished paper, available from Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction, 2888 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah 84106, for $2.25. Excellent, concise overview of various plans.

Selector's Guide for Elementary School Reading Programs, Vols. I and II. Reviews of elementary reading series, quite detailed, available from EPIE Institute, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York, 10027.

Silvaroli Classroom Reading Inventory. Published by Wm. C. Brown, 135 So. Locust Street, Dubuque, Iowa 52001. This informal classroom reading inventory has become a classic. Could serve as a useful model for developing IRIs based on other materials, or could be used as a tool for diagnosis and placement. Contains reproducible word lists and graded passages.

Secondary Reading

Burmeister, Lou. Reading Strategies for Middle and Secondary School Teachers. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978. Excellent methods book. Good guidelines for conducting informal inventories in secondary classrooms, discussions of readability, vocabulary instruction, and ways of reinforcing reading skills in "content areas."

Criscuolo, Nicholas P. Upgrading secondary reading programs: An annotated bibliography. English Journal, January 1979, 62-65.

Reading in the Secondary School, 1977-78. A publication of the Oregon State Department of Education, this would be an excellent starting place for considering this topic.

Research Reviews

Organizing for instruction. Reporting on Reading, March 1979. A free publication of Right to Read. Write CEMREL, Inc., 3120 59th Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63139, to be put on mailing list. Very nice overviews of important topics in reading. Relevant issues could be reproduced (no cost) for distribution in your building.

Brophy, Jere, and Evertson, Carolyn. Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976. This book ought to be read! It reviews important research on teacher effectiveness at primary levels, in language that can be understood and read quickly. There is much to think about here.

Excellent, brief reviews of reading research are published each month in The Reading Teacher, and the Journal of Reading. These journals, at elementary and secondary levels, should be coming into buildings for regular reading. The next three references are three reviews of interest.

Guthrie, John T. Grouping for reading. The Reading Teacher, January 1979.

Jolly, Thomas. Mastery learning and reading. Journal of Reading, May 1979.

Rupley, William H., and Blair, Timothy R. Teacher effectiveness in reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, May 1978.

General Works of Interest

Educational Programs That Work, Vo. 4. Washington, D.C. HEW, USOE, Winter 1977.

Page, William D., ed. Help for the Reading Teacher: New Directions in Research, 1975. Available from International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware. Not easy reading, but important information.

Shane, Harold G. and Walden, James., eds. Classroom-Relevant Research in the Language Arts, 1978. Available from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1701 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. Written for the nonspecialist, this publication discusses elementary and secondary reading trends, spelling, writing.

Weber, G. Inner-City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Readability

If you plan to ask teachers to estimate the readability of texts they are considering, the following would be a handy tool to have on hand.

Fry Readability Scale. Available from Jamestown Publishers, P.O. Box 6743, Providence, Rhode Island 02940, for $2.25.

Testing

If you would like clear, nontechnical discussions of topics and issues related to testing write to the Test Department, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. Ask for their "Test Service Notebooks."

Blanton, William; Farr, Roger, and Tuinman, J. Reading Tests for the Secondary Grades. Available from International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware. Review and evaluation of standard tests.

Mastery Learning

If you are interested in learning more about a widely used mastery learning model for the teaching of reading and language arts, write Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI), 2888 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah 84106. ECRI publishes a newsletter which is free. Also, there are several ECRI districts in Oregon; ask for names if you would like to visit.

* Stanines are equally spaced steps along a scale, having a low of one (1) and a high of nine (9) in which five (5) represents average or typical performance for the norm group.